

Universal Measure of Entanglement

M. Hossein Partovi

Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University, Sacramento, California 95819-6041

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

A general framework is developed for separating classical and quantum correlations in a multipartite system. Entanglement is defined as the difference in the correlation information encoded by the state of a system and a suitably defined separable state with the same marginals. A generalization of the Schmidt decomposition is developed to implement the separation of correlations for any pure, multipartite state. The measure based on this decomposition is a generalization of the entanglement of formation to multipartite systems, provides an upper bound for the relative entropy of entanglement, and is directly computable on pure states. The example of pure three-qubit states is analyzed in detail, and a classification based on minimal, four-term decompositions is developed.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.-a, 03.65.-w

Entanglement is the simultaneous occurrence of superposition and correlation in composite systems, and gives rise to some of the most counterintuitive phenomena of quantum mechanics. It was Einstein's early misgivings about the nonlocality implicit in entangled states [1] that led to the celebrated EPR paper [2]. This paper in turn inspired Schrödinger's cat paradox and his prophetic identification of entanglement as the most characteristic feature of quantum mechanics [3]. A striking confirmation of this prediction is provided by Bell's renowned inequality, which is violated by a pure state if and only if it is entangled [4]. Long at the center of most foundational discussions, and widely regarded as the essence of quantum strangeness, entanglement has in recent years emerged as the key *resource* in quantum information processing [5]. This remarkable transformation of paradox into paradigm was brought about by the explosion of interest in quantum computing and communication in recent years [6].

The quantification of entanglement has thus emerged as a central problem in quantum information theory. Among the proposed measures, the pioneering contributions of Bennett *et al.* [7, 8] defined entanglements of formation and distillation, E_F and E_D respectively, on considerations of convertibility vis-à-vis maximally entangled pairs. Indeed E_F and E_D ($\leq E_F$) are in effect benchmark *buy* and *sell* exchange rates for maximally entangled states, with any other "good" measure of entanglement expected to fall in between [9]. On the other hand, the relative entropy of entanglement [10], denoted by E_R , is based on distinguishability from the set of separable states, with relative entropy serving as a measure of *contrast* [11]. These and most other proposed measures are based on operational considerations of quantum communications or similarly motivated mathematical axioms [12]. While bipartite entanglement is for the most part well understood, a general formulation of the multipartite case is lacking and remains an outstanding unsolved problem.

In this Letter we develop a definition of entanglement

based on general, rather than operational or axiomatic, considerations. We also develop a generalization of the Schmidt decomposition [13] to implement this separation for pure, multipartite states, and extend this to all multipartite states. To see the main idea in qualitative terms, let us consider a state ρ of a composite system together with its reduced (i.e., unipartite) density matrices $\rho^A, \rho^B, \dots, \rho^Z$, which represent the states of the components. The latter are the quantum marginals of ρ , and collectively carry less information than does ρ , the difference being the correlation information encoded by ρ . Furthermore, because of the superpositions it may contain, ρ in general encodes more correlation information than any classically correlated state that possesses the same set of marginals. The difference, minimized subject to suitable constraints, is then a measure of nonclassical correlations, or entanglement, encoded by ρ . Note that this definition is based on separating the correlations encoded by a quantum state into classical and nonclassical parts by reference to a *common set of marginals* [14]. Note also that this notion of separation is already implicit in the standard entanglement measure for pure bipartite states.

We now proceed to a quantitative formulation of the above ideas. Our objective is to define a classically correlated state σ associated with ρ . We require σ to (i) be separable, i.e., a mixture of pure, product states, and (ii) possess the same set of marginals as ρ . We further require σ to encode the greatest correlation information while having the least contrast [11] against ρ . Constraint (i) ensures that the correlations encoded by σ are classical in nature [15], while constraint (ii) guarantees that these correlations can be meaningfully compared to those of ρ . Furthermore, the maximum correlation condition stipulates that σ capture as much of the correlation content of ρ as possible, so that only nonclassical correlations are counted as entanglement, while the minimum contrast requirement requires that σ differ as little as possible from ρ . Following Ref. [10], we use relative entropy as our measure of contrast.

For pure bipartite states, minimizing relative entropy

subject to constraint (i) is sufficient to satisfy (ii) and the maximum correlation condition as well [10]. However, the bipartite case is special, as evidenced by, e.g., the fact that the Schmidt decomposition [13] does not in general extend beyond $N = 2$ [16]. The distinguishing characteristic here is the index N_{ms} , which we define as the number of distinct marginal spectra possessed by a pure state [17]. Now $N_{ms} = 1$ for $N = 2$, and $1 \leq N_{ms} \leq N$ for $N \geq 3$. Furthermore, one can easily show that a pure state is Schmidt-decomposable if and only if $N_{ms} = 1$ [18]. Thus $N = 2$ is special, and there is no *a priori* reason to expect the maximum correlation and minimum contrast requirements to be equivalent in the multipartite case. Since this equivalency is a prerequisite for the above optimization problem, we add the condition $\text{tr}[(\sigma - \rho) \log(\sigma)] = 0$, labelled (iii), which turns out to have an interesting interpretation as seen below.

Let $\mathcal{M}(\rho)$ be the set of states that satisfy constraints (i)-(iii). Then the correlation information contained in ρ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\rho)$ are respectively given by $C^\rho = S(\tilde{\rho}) - S(\rho)$ and $C^\sigma = S(\tilde{\sigma}) - S(\sigma)$, where $S(\chi)$ stands for the von Neumann entropy of χ , and $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho^A \otimes \rho^B \otimes \dots \otimes \rho^Z$ represents the joint, uncorrelated state of the marginals of ρ or σ . The nonclassical correlation information is thus given by the difference $C^\rho - C^\sigma = S(\sigma) - S(\rho)$. Since the above extremal conditions require the simultaneous maximization of C^σ and minimization of $S(\rho\|\sigma)$, we must ensure that their sum, $S(\tilde{\sigma}) - S(\sigma) + S(\rho\|\sigma)$, is a fixed quantity. This is precisely what is achieved by (iii), which reduces the sum to $S(\tilde{\rho}) - S(\rho)$, thus guaranteeing the desired equivalency. Moreover, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\rho)$, (iii) is equivalent to

$$S(\rho\|\sigma) + S(\sigma\|\tilde{\rho}) = S(\rho\|\tilde{\rho}), \quad (1)$$

which stipulates an additivity condition on contrast in comparing ρ to $\tilde{\rho}$ via σ . Note that inasmuch as contrast (= relative entropy) plays the role of distance here, we may interpret (iii) as requiring that σ be on a straight contrast line from ρ to $\tilde{\rho}$.

The entanglement measure is now defined as the minimum of nonclassical correlations:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\rho) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\rho)} [S(\sigma) - S(\rho)] \\ &= \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(\rho)} S(\rho\|\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and will simply be referred to as “entanglement.” Note that because of (iii), $\mathcal{M}(\rho)$ is not convex, so that there may be multiple local minima for (2). Note also that $E = E_F = E_R$ on pure bipartite states, and because of (ii) and (iii), $E \geq E_R$ on all states. This completes our discussion of the general framework and definition of entanglement.

Next, we develop a generalization of the Schmidt decomposition [19] as a means of developing an entanglement measure on pure, multipartite states. Specifically,

our objective is a minimal, orthogonal decomposition of any pure state $|\psi\rangle$ such that its decohered form $\sigma(\psi)$ obeys conditions (i)-(iii); we shall refer to these as *compact* decompositions. Compact decompositions are in effect continued Schmidt decompositions: start by applying the Schmidt decomposition to $|\psi\rangle$ with respect to A and $(BC\dots Z)$ as the two subsystems,

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_a} \sqrt{\lambda_{i_a}^A} |\psi_{i_a}^A\rangle \otimes |\psi_{i_a}^{BC\dots Z}\rangle, \quad (3)$$

then to $|\psi_{i_a}^{BC\dots Z}\rangle$ with respect to B and $(C\dots Z)$ as the two subsystems, and continue the process to the last step where Y and Z are decomposed. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \sum_{i_a i_b \dots i_{yz}} (\lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \dots \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^{YZ})^{\frac{1}{2}} |\psi_{i_a}^A\rangle \otimes \\ &|\psi_{i_a; i_b}^B\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^Y\rangle \otimes |\psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^Z\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This expansion has a tree structure with each ket and its associated coefficient carrying a set of indices which label the successive branch numbers. Accordingly, the collection of kets with all but the rightmost index (which is set off by a semicolon) equal constitute an orthonormal set. For example,

$$\langle \psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_v; i_w}^W | \psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_v; j_w}^W \rangle = \delta_{i_w j_w}. \quad (5)$$

For each such condition, there is a corresponding one for its Schmidt mate, namely

$$\langle \psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_v; i_w}^{XYZ} | \psi_{i_a i_b \dots i_v; j_w}^{XYZ} \rangle = \delta_{i_w j_w}. \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the collection of λ 's with all but the rightmost index fixed constitutes a probability set. For example,

$$\sum_{i_w} \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_v; i_w}^W = 1. \quad (7)$$

Note that the last two subsystems in (4) share a common set of indices and a common coefficient as in a standard Schmidt decomposition. Thus there are at most $d^A d^B \dots d^X \min(d^Y, d^Z)$ terms in the above expansion, where, e.g., d^A is the dimension of $\mathcal{H}^A$, the Hilbert space belonging to subsystem A . Except for the last pair, changing the order of subsystems in Eq. (4) in general results in a different decomposition. Therefore, allowing for possible degeneracies, there are $N!/2$ compact decompositions for an N -partite system. For three qubits, e.g., there are no more than three decompositions each containing no more than 4 terms.

The decohered form of ψ in the basis of Eq. (4) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi) &= \sum_{i_a i_b \dots i_{yz}} \lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \dots \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^{YZ} \pi_{i_a}^A \otimes \\ &\pi_{i_a; i_b}^B \otimes \dots \otimes \pi_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^Y \otimes \pi_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^Z, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where each state vector in (4) has been replaced with the corresponding projection operator in (8). The orthonormality conditions stated above can now be used to

show that (a) the expansion given in Eq. (8) is orthogonal, (b) $\sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi)$ has the same marginals as ψ , and (c) $\text{tr}[\sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi) - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \log[\sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi)]] = 0$. In other words, $\sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi)$ satisfies conditions (i)-(iii) above. It is not difficult to show that among all possible ways of decomposing a pure state by means of a sequence of Schmidt decompositions, compact decompositions are unique in guaranteeing conditions (a)-(c) stated above.

Denoting the set of $N!/2$ possible σ 's by $\mathcal{M}^c(\psi)$, we define the entanglement of ψ following Eq. (2):

$$E^c(\psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}^c(\psi)} S(\sigma), \quad (9)$$

where the superscript “c” refers to compact decompositions as the basis of E^c . If this minimum is realized on, say, $\sigma^{AB\dots Z}(\psi)$, we have

$$E^c(\psi) = -\sum_{i_a i_b \dots i_{yz}} \lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \dots \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^{YZ} \times \log(\lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \dots \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x; i_{yz}}^{YZ}). \quad (10)$$

The bounds on the entanglement of a system of N parties each with a Hilbert space of dimension d are given by $0 \leq E^c \leq (N-1) \log(d)$. Note that Eqs. (9) and (10) provide a readily computable, finite prescription for finding $E^c(\psi)$. This is in contrast to Eqs. (2) and (17) which involve nontrivial minimizations over infinite sets. It can also be verified that E^c (as well as E) is invariant under local unitary operations, and that its expected value is non-increasing under local operations and classical communications [8, 10].

Eq. (10) can be rearranged as

$$E^c(\psi) = H(\lambda^A) + \sum_{i_a} \lambda_{i_a}^A H(\lambda_{i_a}^B) + \dots + \sum_{i_a i_b \dots i_x} \lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \dots \lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x}^X H(\lambda_{i_a i_b \dots i_x}^{YZ}), \quad (11)$$

where, e.g.,

$$H(\lambda_{i_a}^B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\sum_{i_b} \lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B \log(\lambda_{i_a; i_b}^B) \quad (12)$$

is the information associated with the probability set $\{\lambda_{i_a}^B\}$. This nested pattern is of course inherited from the tree structure of compact decompositions noted above.

Next we consider the three-qubit case as an illustration of the foregoing construction. There are three compact decompositions for a tripartite pure state ψ which may be labelled ψ^{ABC} , ψ^{BCA} , and ψ^{CAB} , where, e.g.,

$$|\psi^{ABC}\rangle = \sum_{i_a i_b c} \lambda_{i_a}^A \lambda_{i_a; i_b c}^{BC} |\psi_{i_a}^A\rangle \otimes |\psi_{i_a; i_b c}^B\rangle \otimes |\psi_{i_a; i_b c}^C\rangle. \quad (13)$$

For three qubits represented as spin states, each of these can be brought to the following standard form by local unitary transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle^{ABC} = & \sqrt{p_1} |+\rangle^A \otimes |+\rangle^B \otimes |+\rangle^C \\ & + \sqrt{p_2} e^{i\alpha} |+\rangle^A \otimes |-\rangle^B \otimes |-\rangle^C \\ & + \sqrt{p_3} |-\rangle^A \otimes |\theta_b+\rangle^B \otimes |\theta_c+\rangle^C \\ & + \sqrt{p_4} e^{i\beta} |-\rangle^A \otimes |\theta_b-\rangle^B \otimes |\theta_c-\rangle^C, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $|+\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \cos(\theta/2)|\uparrow\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|-\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sin(\theta/2)|\uparrow\rangle - \cos(\theta/2)|\downarrow\rangle$. In addition to the normalization condition $\sum_i p_i = 1$, there are two further constraints on the four real angles appearing in (14),

$$\tan(\theta_b/2) \tan(\theta_c/2) = -\frac{(p_1 p_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (p_2 p_4)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i(\beta-\alpha)}}{(p_1 p_4)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\beta} + (p_2 p_3)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-i\alpha}}, \quad (15)$$

leaving a total of five independent, real parameters. This is in agreement with previous results [19], although these involve a minimum of five terms in their decompositions as compared to four here.

When decohered, each of the three compact decompositions of ψ yields a diagonal, separable density matrix of no more than four terms which satisfies conditions (i)-(iii). Among these, the density matrix with the least entropy defines the entanglement of ψ . Therefore, $E^c(\psi)$ equals $-\sum_i p_i^* \log(p_i^*)$, or simply $H(p^*)$, where $\{p^*\}$ is the probability set corresponding to the minimal state. It is clear from this formula that $0 \leq E^c(\psi) \leq \log(4)$. A simple example of a maximally entangled three-qubit state is obtained from (14) by setting $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = \pi$, $\theta_b = 0$, $\theta_c = \pi$, and $p_i^* = 1/4$. The three decompositions of this state are identical due to its symmetry. This state may be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle = & \frac{1}{2} |+\rangle^A \otimes \frac{1}{2} (|++\rangle + |--\rangle)^{BC} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} |-\rangle^A \otimes \frac{1}{2} (|+-\rangle + |-+\rangle)^{BC}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The entanglement of this state is $\log(4)$ units which, by way of comparison, is twice as large as the entanglement of the GHZ state $\frac{1}{2}(|+++ \rangle + |--\rangle)$ [20]. Referring to Eq. (11), we interpret this result as representing $\log(2)$ units for the bipartite entanglement of A versus (BC) , and $\log(2)$ units for the average entanglement of the two Bell states that make up p^{BC} .

Pure three-qubit states are naturally classified in terms of the ranks of their marginal spectra (see Ref. [19] for an alternative scheme). Class I corresponds to all marginals being of rank one, and consists of product states with zero entanglement. These correspond to $p_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$ in (14), with $N_{ms} = 1$. Class II corresponds to one marginal being of rank one, the other two full rank. These are product states of pure one-qubit and two-qubit states, with the entanglement carried by the latter. Such states correspond to $p_3 = p_4 = 0$ in (14), with $N_{ms} = 2$. Class III corresponds to all marginals being full rank. This class is conveniently subclassified as III-a,b,c, corresponding to $N_{ms} = 1, 2, 3$, respectively. With $N_{ms} = 1$, Class III-a admits a standard Schmidt decomposition [18] corresponding to $p_2 = p_3 = \theta_b = \theta_c = 0$ in (14). The further restriction $p_1 = p_4$ leads to the GHZ state mentioned above. Class III-b has $N_{ms} = 2$ and corresponds to $\theta_b = \theta_c$ in (14). Class III-c with $N_{ms} = 3$ is the typical case shown in (14). It is clear that only class III states

carry tripartite entanglement, while I and II are better described as products of one-qubit and two-qubit states.

Having described compact decompositions and the associated entanglement measure E^c on pure, multipartite states, we now proceed to extend the latter to mixed states. The method we use was pioneered in Ref. [8], and has since been found to be a generally valid strategy for extending pure state measures to all states [21]. The key idea is to define the entanglement of an ensemble of pure states to be the ensemble average of the entanglement. The minimum of this quantity over all possible ensemble representations of a mixed state is then defined as its entanglement. In symbols,

$$E^c(\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} E^c(|\psi_{\alpha}\rangle\langle\psi_{\alpha}|), \quad (17)$$

where the minimum is taken over all possible ensemble representations $\sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} |\psi_{\alpha}\rangle\langle\psi_{\alpha}|$ of ρ . It is interesting to note that ensemble averages of pure state entanglement are implicit in the tree structure of compact decompositions, as may be seen in Eq. (11), and in the above example of a maximally entangled three-qubit state as well. Note also that since E^c and E_F are equal on pure bipartite states, they must coincide on all bipartite states. Therefore, E^c as extended by Eq. (17) is a generalization of E_F to all multipartite states. Furthermore, because compact decompositions satisfy conditions (ii) and (iii), we have $E^c \geq E_R$ on all multipartite states.

Thus far we have defined two measures of entanglement, E in Eq. (2), and E^c in Eqs. (9) and (17). Considering pure states for the moment, we defined these measures by minimizing nonclassical correlations over $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^c$, sets of states that satisfy conditions (i)-(iii). While $\mathcal{M}$ includes all such states and is infinite, $\mathcal{M}^c$ includes states derived from compact decompositions only and is finite. Thus $E \leq E^c$ on pure states, with equality known to hold on bipartite states. Since we expect compact decompositions to be minimal representations, it is likely that $E^c = E$ on all pure states, although we have not succeeded in establishing this equality in general. In the event that the equality holds on pure states, there arises the question of whether the two measures coincide on mixed states as well, also an open question at present. If E turns out to be strictly smaller than E^c on pure states, then E^c provides a readily computable upper bound for E .

Entanglement has been defined here as nonclassical correlation information, without any direct reference to operational considerations [22]. The results, however, are remarkably close to operationally inspired measures of entanglement, affirming the expectation that there must be a universal meaning to the quantity of entanglement embodied in a quantum system.

This work was supported in part by a research grant from California State University, Sacramento.

-
- [1] L. Rosenfeld, “Niels Bohr in the thirties: consolidation and extension of the conception of complementarity,” in *Niels Bohr: His life and work as seen by his friends and colleagues*, S. Rozental, ed. (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1967), p. 114.
 - [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and W. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
 - [3] E. Schrödinger, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **31**, 555 (1935); *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807, 823, 844 (1935).
 - [4] J. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964). The equivalence between entanglement and Bell inequality violation does not hold for mixed states; see A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2685 (1996), for a summary as well as references to the original papers.
 - [5] C. H. Bennet, *Phys. Scr.* **T76**, 210 (1998).
 - [6] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England 2000).
 - [7] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722 (1996); C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996).
 - [8] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
 - [9] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2014 (2000).
 - [10] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1619 (1998), and references therein. See also V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 197 (2002).
 - [11] We use “contrast,” in contradistinction to “distance,” to designate any suitable measure of distinguishability.
 - [12] M. Horodecki, *Quant. Info. Comp.* **1**, 3 (2001).
 - [13] E. Schmidt, *Math. Ann.* **63**, 433 (1907).
 - [14] After completing this work, I learned of the following papers where marginals are referenced in formulating entanglement: J. Eisert, K. Audenaert, and M. B. Plenio, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36**, 5605 (2003); A. K. Rajagopal and R. W. Rendell, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 022104 (2002); N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W. K. Wootters, *quant-ph/0207109*.
 - [15] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 4277 (1989).
 - [16] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993), p. 125.
 - [17] To avoid trivial degeneracies, we will consider all spectra arranged in a nonincreasing order.
 - [18] The converse states that, given a probability set, there is a Schmidt-decomposable N -partite state in a suitably large Hilbert space all of whose marginal spectra equal the given set.
 - [19] A. Acín, A. Andrianov, L. Costa, E. Jané, J. I. Latorre, and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1560 (2000). Also see T. Brun and O. Cohen, *Phys. Lett. A* **281**, 88 (2001), where attempts at generalization are reviewed.
 - [20] D. Greenberger, M. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 1131 (1990).
 - [21] A. Uhlmann, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **5**, 209 (1998).
 - [22] The convertibility of multipartite to bipartite entanglement is not well understood at present.